

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 remain pending in this application, with claims 15 and 16 being withdrawn by this response.

Claim 1 is amended to comport with US rules of claims drafting as to make the clause “concerns the status of the data network or a device of said data network” to now be “concerns at least one of the status of the data network or a device of said data network”. No new matter was added in view of this amendment.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended in a telephonic conversation with Mr. Joel M. Fogelson on March 4, 2008. During this conversation, affirmation of the election of claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 10-14 was made. Claims 15 and 16 were withdrawn from further consideration.

Rejection of claims 1, 5-8 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a)

Claims 1, 5-8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Angal (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,378).

The present claimed invention provides a method for using a topology editor to prescribe a device notified in response to an event related to the operation of a data network and the event. The event pertaining to operation of a data network is defined. The operation concerns the status of the data network or a device of the data network. A group consisting of a plurality of devices of the data network to be notified in response to the event is assigned by the topology editor. A rule is assigned to the event, the rule defining at least one condition for triggering a notification of the event to the assigned device. The condition is to be activated when matched to a notification of the operation of the data network. Angal neither discloses nor suggests these features.

Angal describes an event distribution system for computer network management architecture. A technique is used for reporting events raised by entities running on

computer networks. When an event is generated from an event source and received by an event distribution system, the event distribution system processes and forwards the event, or notification of the event, to an appropriate listener (*see* Abstract).

Angal neither discloses nor suggests “assigning a group consisting of a plurality of devices of said data network to be notified in response to said event by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. The previous Office Action, dated November 2, 2007, correctly admits that Angal does not disclose or suggest this feature. Specifically, claims 1, 5-8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angal in view of Goodrich in the Office Action dated November 2, 2007. On page 4 of the previous Office Action dated November 2, 2007, it is stated that “Angal does not explicitly teach the use of a topology editor.” However, the current Office Action dated March 20, 2008 withdraws the rejection of claims 1, 5-8 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and rejects these claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) over Angal instead. The current Office Action asserts, contrary to the statement made in the previous Office Action, that Angal now does indeed disclose “assigning a group consisting of a plurality of devices of said data network to be notified in response to said event by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. Applicants respectfully disagree. The current Office Action on page 4 cites col. 4, lines 4-30 of Angal and states that in Angal, “event subscriber is being associated with the filter, Fig. 4 and associated reading.” The cited passage merely describes:

“Between the Application and Hardware layers is the Platform layer. This layer comprises network management software designed to allow the network administrator operating an application such as UI 102 access to entities and devices on the network. The network management software also operates to enable communications among various entities installed on the network, including event communications. In one embodiment, the network communications are handled by a central Management Information Server (‘MIS’) 104 that coordinates messages sent between entities running on each of the network layers. MIS 104 interacts with a Name Server 106 that provides a database comprising names and addresses for all entities installed on the network. An example of one such Name Server can be found in co-pending U.S. patent application Ser. No. 09/205,323 ... A Topology Service 112 and a Logging/Alarm Service 114 provide resources for managing network entities and alarms. Examples of these services

can be found in co-pending U.S. patent application Ser. Nos. 09/205,826 and 09/205,911 ... platform level entities further include an Agent 118 and a Message Protocol Adapter ('MPA') 116 that allow communication between Device 120 and MIS 104" (col. 4, lines 4-28).

Thus, the cited passage describes enabling communication among various entities installed on the network. The MIS coordinates messages sent between entities running on each of the network layers. A topology service and a logging/alarm service provides resources for managing network entities and alarms. However, nowhere in the cited passage or elsewhere in Angal is there any mention or suggestion of a "topology editor," and therefore, Angal does not disclose or suggest "assigning a group consisting of a plurality of devices of said data network to be notified in response to said event by use of said topology editor" as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement.

The present claimed arrangement uses a **topology editor** to associate a group of devices to an event, where the group of devices will be notified in response to the event. Thus, when an event occurs, the group of devices will be notified based upon a set of rules defined in the topology editor (*see* Specification, page 8, lines 6-17). The present claimed arrangement assigns devices for notification purposes "in response to said event by use of said topology editor." Unlike the present claimed arrangement, Angal merely provides an event handling system for a computer network management architecture to process large numbers of events. Angal does not disclose or suggest a "topology editor," as in the present claimed arrangement, and therefore, Angal cannot disclose or suggest "assigning a group consisting of a plurality of devices of said data network to be notified in response to said event by use of said topology editor" as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) should be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Angal does not anticipate or make unpatentable the features of the present claimed arrangement, as claimed in claim 1. As claims 5-7 are dependent on independent claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5-7 are not anticipated or made unpatentable by Angal.

Therefore, applicants further respectfully submit that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 8 provides a method for using a topology editor to notify a group of devices in response to an event related to the operation of a data network. A notification related to the operation of the data network is received. The operation is related to a status of the data network or a device of the data network. The notification is compared to a condition of a rule. A defined group of devices are notified in response to the event with an action provider. The notification of the defined group of devices in response to the event is defined by use of the topology editor. Angal neither discloses nor suggests these features.

Angal describes an event distribution system for computer network management architecture. Angal neither discloses nor suggests “notifying a defined group of devices in response to said event with an action provider, wherein notification of said defined group of devices in response to said event is defined by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 8 of the present arrangement. The previous Office Action, dated November 2, 2007, correctly admits that Angal does not disclose or suggest this feature. Specifically, claims 1, 5-8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angal in view of Goodrich in the Office Action dated November 2, 2007. On pages 5-6 of the previous Office Action dated November 2, 2007, it is stated that “However, Angal does not explicitly teach the use of a topology editor.” However, the current Office Action dated March 20, 2008 withdraws the rejection of claims 1, 5-8 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and rejects these claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) over Angal instead. The current Office Action asserts, contrary to the statement made in the previous Office Action, that Angal now does indeed disclose “notifying a defined group of devices in response to said event with an action provider, wherein notification of said defined group of devices in response to said event is defined by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 8 of the present arrangement. Applicants respectfully disagree. The current Office Action on page 6 cites col. 4, lines 4-30 of Angal as disclosing “wherein notification of said defined group of devices in response to said event is defined

by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 8 of the present arrangement. Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in this cited passage or elsewhere is there suggestion or disclosure of a topology editor. The cited passage merely describes:

“Between the Application and Hardware layers is the Platform layer. This layer comprises network management software designed to allow the network administrator operating an application such as UI 102 access to entities and devices on the network. The network management software also operates to enable communications among various entities installed on the network, including event communications. In one embodiment, the network communications are handled by a central Management Information Server (‘MIS’) 104 that coordinates messages sent between entities running on each of the network layers. MIS 104 interacts with a Name Server 106 that provides a database comprising names and addresses for all entities installed on the network. An example of one such Name Server can be found in co-pending U.S. patent application Ser. No. 09/205,323 ... A Topology Service 112 and a Logging/Alarm Service 114 provide resources for managing network entities and alarms. Examples of these services can be found in co-pending U.S. patent application Ser. Nos. 09/205,826 and 09/205,911 ... platform level entities further include an Agent 118 and a Message Protocol Adapter (‘MPA’) 116 that allow communication between Device 120 and MIS 104” (col. 4, lines 4-28).

Thus, the cited passage describes enabling communication among various entities installed on the network. The MIS coordinates messages sent between entities running on each of the network layers. A topology service and a logging/alarm service provides resources for managing network entities and alarms. However, nowhere in the cited passage or elsewhere in Angal is there any mention or suggestion of a “topology editor,” and therefore, Angal does not disclose or suggest “notifying a defined group of devices in response to said event with an action provider, wherein notification of said defined group of devices in response to said event is defined by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 8 of the present arrangement.

The present claimed arrangement uses a **topology editor** to associate a group of devices to an event, where the group of devices will be notified in response to the event. Thus, when an event occurs, the group of devices will be notified based upon a set of rules defined in the topology editor (*see* Specification, page 8, lines 6-17). The present claimed arrangement notifies “a defined group of devices in response to said event with

an action provider, wherein notification of said defined group of devices in response to said event is defined by use of said topology editor.” Unlike the present claimed arrangement, Angal merely provides an event handling system for a computer network management architecture to process large numbers of events. Angal does not disclose or suggest a “topology editor,” as in the present claimed arrangement, and therefore, Angal cannot disclose or suggest “wherein notification of said defined group of devices in response to said event is defined by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 8 of the present arrangement. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) should be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Angal does not anticipate or make unpatentable the features of the present claimed arrangement, as claimed in claim 8. As claims 11 and 12 are dependent on independent claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11 and 12 are not anticipated or made unpatentable by Angal. Therefore, applicants further respectfully submit that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Claim 13 is dependent on claim 8 and is allowable for the same reasons presented above regarding claim 8 (and claim 1). Additionally, claim 13 is not anticipated by Angal because Angal neither discloses nor suggests that “said topology editor operates with in view of a consumer electronics enabled interoperability standard.” Cited col. 4, lines 4-30 of Angal is not related to and does not disclose or suggest a topology editor. Rather, the cited passage merely describes enabling communication between various entities installed on a network and a topology service and a logging/alarm service that provides resources for managing network entities and alarms. As described above with respect to claim 1 (and claim 8), Angal nowhere in the cited passage or elsewhere discloses or suggests a topology editor, as in the present claimed arrangement. Moreover, the cited passage describes that the platform level includes a “Message Protocol Adapter (‘MPA’) 116 that allow[s] communication between Device 120 and MIS 1-4” (col. 4, lines 26-28). However, Angal does not disclose or suggest a “topology editor” and therefore, the MPA cited in the cited passage is not equivalent to and does not disclose or

suggest that “said topology editor operates with in view of a **consumer electronics enabled interoperability standard**” as recited in claim 13 of the present arrangement. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) should be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 8 are not anticipated or made unpatentable by Angal. As claims 5-7 and 11-13 are dependant on claims 1 and 8, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that 5-7 and 11-13 are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above regarding claims 1 and 8. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 3, 10 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 3, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angal in view of Vining (U.S. Patent No. 7,152,075).

Vining describes a system and method for removing rules form a data administration system. When a new rule is entered into the system with an already existing rule, parameters of existing rules and new rules are compared to determine if any parameters of new rules encompass parameters of existing rules. If so, the existing rule is removed (*see* Abstract).

Dependent claim 3 is considered patentable for the same reasons presented above with respect to independent claim 1. Specifically, Vining (with Angal) neither discloses nor suggests “assigning a group consisting of a plurality of devices of said data network to be notified in response to said event by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. Vining is silent regarding assigning a topology editor. Therefore, Vining (with Angal) cannot disclose or suggest “assigning a group consisting of a plurality of devices of said data network to be notified in response to said event by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement.

The Office Action further asserts that it would have been obvious to combine the systems of Angal and Vining. Applicants respectfully disagree. Angal describes a system for forwarding events or a notification of an event to an appropriate listener. Vining describes a system for removing existing rules in a data administration system when new rules are entered into the system. Angal is concerned with providing an event handling system for a computer network management architecture to process large numbers of events. However Vining is concerned with removing redundant rules from a database in a data administration system to optimize system performance characteristics and to decrease system storage requirements. Therefore, as Angal is directed towards handling large volumes of network traffic and Vining is concerned with removing redundant rules in a data administration system, it would not be obvious to combine the two systems that are concerned with two different and completely unrelated problems. There is no reason or motivation to combine the systems of Angal and Vining because handling large volumes of network traffic, as in Angal, is completely unrelated to removing redundant rules, as in Vining. Therefore, Angal and Vining are each concerned with completely different objectives and thus, there is on reason or motivation to combine the two systems.

However, even if the systems of Angal and Vining were combined, the combination would neither disclose nor suggest “assigning a group consisting of a plurality of devices of said data network to be notified in response to said event by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. The combined system would consist of an event distribution system for computer network management architecture which forwards an event or notification of the event to an appropriate listener. Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) traps would be sent to a SNMP manager in response to an event. In contrast, the present claimed arrangement utilizes a topology editor to “establish functional relationships between devices on a data network” (Specification, page 4, lines 6-8). Rules are set up in the topology editor to determine how a device is to be notified when an event occurs. Devices are dragged and dropped into different folders which represent different rules and events (*see* Specification page 7, line 34 to page 8, line 5). However, the combination of Angal and Vining, similar to the

individual systems, neither discloses nor suggests “assigning a group consisting of a plurality of devices of said data network to be notified in response to said event by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement.

In view of the above remarks it is respectfully submitted that Angal and Vining, when taken alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest “assigning a group consisting of a plurality of devices of said data network to be notified in response to said event by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. As claim 3 is dependent on claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 3 is similarly patentable over Angal and Vining, when taken alone or in combination. Therefore, applicants further respectfully submit that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 10 and 14 are considered patentable for the same reasons presented above with respect to independent claim 8. Specifically, Vining (with Angal) neither discloses nor suggests that “notification of said defined group of devices in response to said event is defined by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 8 of the present arrangement. Vining is silent regarding assigning a topology editor. Therefore, Vining (with Angal) cannot disclose or suggest “notifying a defined group of devices in response to said event with an action provider, wherein notification of said defined group of devices in response to said event is defined by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 8 of the present arrangement.

The Office Action further asserts that it would have been obvious to combine the systems of Angal and Vining. Applicants respectfully disagree. Angal describes a system for forwarding events or a notification of an event to an appropriate listener. Vining describes a system for removing existing rules in a data administration system when new rules are entered into the system. Angal is concerned with providing an event handling system for a computer network management architecture to process large numbers of events. However Vining is concerned with removing redundant rules from a database in a data administration system to optimize system performance characteristics

and to decrease system storage requirements. Therefore, as Angal is directed towards handling large volumes of network traffic and Vining is concerned with removing redundant rules in a data administration system, it would not be obvious to combine the two systems that are concerned with two different and completely unrelated problems. There is no reason or motivation to combine the systems of Angal and Vining because handling large volumes of network traffic, as in Angal, is completely unrelated to removing redundant rules, as in Vining. Therefore, Angal and Vining are each concerned with completely different objectives and thus, there is on reason or motivation to combine the two systems.

However, even if the systems of Angal and Vining were combined, the combination would neither disclose nor suggest “notifying a defined group of devices in response to said event with an action provider, wherein notification of said defined group of devices in response to said event is defined by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 8 of the present arrangement. The combined system would consist of an event distribution system for computer network management architecture which forwards an event or notification of the event to an appropriate listener. Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) traps would be sent to a SNMP manager in response to an event. In contrast, the present claimed arrangement utilizes a topology editor to “establish functional relationships between devices on a data network” (Specification, page 4, lines 6-8). Rules are set up in the topology editor to determine how a device is to be notified when an event occurs. Devices are dragged and dropped into different folders which represent different rules and events (*see* Specification page 7, line 34 to page 8, line 5). However, the combination of Angal and Vining, similar to the individual systems, neither discloses nor suggests “notifying a defined group of devices in response to said event with an action provider, wherein notification of said defined group of devices in response to said event is defined by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 8 of the present arrangement.

In view of the above remarks it is respectfully submitted that Angal and Vining, when taken alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest “notifying a defined

group of devices in response to said event with an action provider, wherein notification of said defined group of devices in response to said event is defined by use of said topology editor” as recited in claim 8 of the present arrangement. As claims 10 and 14 are dependent on claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that claims 10 and 14 are similarly patentable over Angal and Vining, when taken alone or in combination. Therefore, applicants further respectfully submit that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner’s rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants’ attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Northon Rodrigues et al.

By: /Joel M. Fogelson/
Joel. M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43,613
(609) 734-6807

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing, LLC
P.O. Box 5312,
Princeton, NJ 08543-0028
June 20, 2008